1 DECEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
OSHIMA, Hiroshi (resumed)	34201
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Tavenner	34201
MORNING RECESS	34223
Cross (cent'd) by Mr. Tavenner	34225
NOON RECESS	34242
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Tavenner	34243
AFTERNOON RECESSS	34266
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Tavenner	34269

1 DECEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
OSHIMA, Hiroshi (resumed)	34201
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Tavenner	34201
MORNING RECESS	34223
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Tavenner	34225
NOON RECESS	34242
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Tavenner	34243
AFTERNOON RECESSS	34266
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Tavenner	34269

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For In Ident Evidence
1383F(1)		3518	Telegram No. 480 dated 3 May from Ambassador OSHIMA to Foreign Minister MATSUOKA	34236
1383F(2)		3519	Telegram No. 373 dated 5 May 1941 from Foreign Minister MATSUOKA to Ambassador OSHIMA	34244
889		3520	Supplementary Pro- tocol(Articles 1 to 11)	34246

Monday, 1 December 1947 1 2 3 4 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 5 Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 6 Tokyo, Japan 7 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0930. 10 Appearances: 11 For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with 12 the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE SIR WILLIAM F. 13 WEBB, Member from the Commonwealth of Australia, not 14 sitting from 0930 to 1600. 15 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 16 For the Defense Section, same as before. 17 18 (English to Japanese and Japanese 19 to English interpretation was made by the 20 Language Section, IMTFE.) 21 22 23

24

h a &

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International 2 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

ACTING PRESIDENT: All the accused are present 4 except MATSUI, who is represented by counsel. We have 5 a certificate from the prison surgeon at Sugamo cer-6 tifying that he is ill and unable to attend the trial 7 today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

Mr. Tavenner.

8

1

3

OSHIMA, an accused, resumed the 10 H I R O S H I stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

13

15

16

17

19

21

22

CHOSS-EXAMINATION

14 BY M. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q General OSHIMA, on Friday afternoon I asked you questions relating to what you termed in your article to be the fundamental principle of the Tripartite Pact, and I asked you what Hitler and Mussolini did to carry out the fundamental principle. I now ask you what did Japan do to carry out the fundamental principle of the pact relating to the establishment of the New Order?

23

A Although the idea of the principle of the New Order was one of the purposes of the pact, work did not proceed to the point where it was concretely

h a &

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International 2 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

ACTING PRESIDENT: All the accused are present 4 except MATSUI, who is represented by counsel. We have 5 a certificate from the prison surgeon at Sugamo cer-6 tifying that he is ill and unable to attend the trial 7 today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

Mr. Tavenner.

8

3

OSHIMA, an accused, resumed the 10 H I R O S H I stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

13

15

16

17

19

CHOSS-EXAMINATION

14 BY M. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q General OSHIMA, on Friday afternoon I asked you questions relating to what you termed in your article to be the fundamental principle of the Tripartite Pact, and I asked you what Hitler and Mussolini did to carry out the fundamental principle. I now ask you what did Japan do to carry out the fundamental principle of the pact relating to the establishment of the New Order?

22 23

A Although the idea of the principle of the New Order was one of the purposes of the pact, work did not proceed to the point where it was concretely

h 1 n & M 0 S

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

ACTING PRESIDENT: All the accused are present 4 except MATSUI, who is represented by counsel. We have 5 a certificate from the prison surgeon at Sugamo cer-6 tifying that he is ill and unable to attend the trial 7 today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

Mr. Tavenner.

11

12

OHIROSHI OSHIMA, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

CHOSS-EXAMINATION

General OSHIMA, on Friday afternoon I asked

BY M. TAVENNER (Continued):

of the New Order?

15

you questions relating to what you termed in your article to be the fundamental principle of the Tripartite Pact, and I asked you what Hitler and Mussolini did to carry out the fundamental principle. I now ask you what did Japan do to carry out the fundamental principle of the pact relating to the establishment

21

20

22

23

25

A Although the idea of the principle of the New Order was one of the purposes of the pact, work did not proceed to the point where it was concretely materialized. That is all.

It was not completely materialized because you lost the war, isn't that true?

It is my interpretation and understanding that Japan engaged in war for her own self-defense and not for the purpose of creating a new order.

Q Did not Japan continue the war with China which had been in progress many years prior to the conclusion of the pact?

Japan referred to these hostilities as the China Affair. It is a fact that these hostilities continued.

Q Did not Japan continue its efforts to estab-14 lish the New Order in East Asia under these provisions 15 of the pact by the military occupation of Indo-China 16 where naval and air bases were secured for use by 17 Japan?

In view of the fact that I was then in Ger-19 many I am unable to testify with regard to what Japan was doing in any detail, and for what purpose Japan was engaged in certain things, because I was not notified or informed of these activities.

In your article published in the November 1940 issue of Dai-Asia Shugi you informed the Japanese nation that it was necessary that they cooperate in

1

3

10

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

the establishment of the so-called New Orders of Germany and Italy. Was this not based on these provisions of the pact?

A The Tripartite Pact had already been concluded, an Imperial Rescript and a government statement had been issued, and my statement in the article was a mere repetition of what had already been announced. But I do not refer here to what must be done concretely in order to carry out the pact, rather I am mentioning these matters here more as a symbol, more as an idea than anything else.

Q In other words, General OSHIMA, the latter part of Article 3 of the pact regarding aid in the event of attack by a power not presently engaged in war in Europe or Asia, was in fact designed as a cloak to conceal and a shield to protect the participating powers in the course of conduct in which they were then engaged in Europe and in China, Is that not true?

A Not having participated in the drafting of the pact I do not know actually what the intentions were. But in so far as my understanding is concerned there was absolutely no intention of concealing anything.

Q General OSHIMA, exhibit 559, page 6,417 of

.

.

20

21

23 24

1 t

3

5

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

19

20

22

23 24

25

the transcript, is a memorandum between Japan, Germany and Italy, bearing date 20 December 1940, providing for the establishment of a General Commission, Military Commission and an Economic Commission. Were you head of the General Commission in Berlin?

A Yes. But I was just a member of the General Commission; there was no chairman.

Q Was your commission charged with the responsibility of determining, in the event of war, whether a party to the pact had been attacked within the meaning of Article 3, that is, whether the contracting party was the aggressor or not?

A No, it had no such responsibility. Its work was to assemble all possible data, to report such data to the home government, and the decision on such matters was to be made by the home government.

Q You state that it had no such responsibility?

A No responsibility. Its duty was merely to assemble data.

 Q Now I desire to read to you a question and answer from your interrogation of February 15, 1946:

"Q So that actually this treaty makes no provision that the signatory parties are to help one another only in the event that one has an attack made upon it that is unprovoked. There is no requirement that such a condition exist. It was a mutual aid pact and provided in effect, did it not, that if one of the three is attacked then the other two will help the one that has been attacked?

"A In substance this is what I believe it means.

No, I know it to be so. The right to decide whether one of the signatories was attacked and whether the others will furnish aid is left up to this commission.

To put it differently, let us say that the United States and Germany had gone to war. Japan was not obligated to furnish aid unconditionally. The Commission was to decide whether the attack had occurred or not."

Now, was that question not asked you and that enswer given by you? Please answer yes or no.

A Such a question and enswer took place but there must have been some rigunderstanding or some misinterpretation in what is written on what you have just quoted from. The memorandum clearly stipulates that the decision was to be made by the contracting powers. If

2

10

11

12 13

14

15

19

21

20

22

25

Now I desire to read to you a question and answer from your interrogation of February 15, 1946:

"Q So that actually this treaty makes no provision that the signatory parties are to help one another only in the event that one has an attack made upon it that is unprovoked. There is no requirement that such a condition exist. It was a mutual aid pact and provided in effect, did it not, that if one of the three is attacked then the other two will help the one that has been attacked?

"A In substance this is what I believe it means. No, I know it to be so. The right to decide whether one of the signatories was attacked and whether the others will furnish aid is left up to this commission. To put it differently, let us say that the United States and Germany had some to war. Japan was not obligated to furnish aid unconditionally. The Commission was to decide whether the attack had occurred or not."

Now, was that question not asked you and that answer given by you? Please answer yes or no.

A Such a question and answer took place but there must have been some ziaunderstanding or some misinterpretation in what is written on what you have just quoted from. The memorandum clearly stipulates that the decision was to be made by the contracting powers. If

you will see the memorandum the matter would be quite clear. Of course, it would be quite possible for the question as to who attacked or who was attacked would come up for discussion at the conference of the general commission but the procedure was that reports of the data be sent to the home governments and for the home governments to make the decision.

Q Was this general commission of which you were a member ever called into session to determine who was the aggressor between a party to the pact and a third power?

A No, not once.

Minister, Navy Minister and Foreign Minister at the time of the establishment of the commission under the Tripartite Pact which changed the existing rule relating to the duties of an ambassador by providing that in the case of the ambassador to Germany permission was given to discuss matters of a military nature with German officials if the Japanese military and naval attaches and members of the military commission accompanied the ambassador to such conferences?

A That requires some explanation. The duties were not changed. There was no change in principle that the ambassador being a civil official was not to

1.0

2

4

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

participate in military matters. However, because High Command metters were not handled in Germany and Italy as they were in Japan, if such matters should ever come up for discussion at the meeting of the general commission it was unaroidable that the Japanese ambassador must take up the matter and restriction was placed in this regard that the embassador on such occasion must be accompanied by the military and naval attaches.

Just a moment. I did not confine my question to meetings of the commission. My question was broader then that. It referred to discussions generally with German officers.

As I have said before, this was the power given to the ambassador in discussing at the general commission.

Q e11, I am asking you if you weren't given power to discuss military matters with German officials generally, not merely at conferences of the commission.

A No, I was not given any such authority.

Well, is it a fact that you did frequently discuss military matters with Hitler, Ribbentrop and other high-ranking German officials without having present at the conferences any of the officials required to be there under the joint order that I read to you?

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

At times the German, side brought up matters of a general nature but they were never discussed. When such matters came up, inasmuch as they did not require negotiations with the Japanese government, I transmitted them to the military -- transmitted to the military and naval attaches and these attaches in turn communicated with their headquarters in Tokyo.

(Whereupon, at the request of the Monitor, the Japanese court reporter read.) THE MONITOR: No corrections.

THE INTERPRITIE: The witness explained to the reporter who had taken down that the Japanese military and navel attaches took the matter up with the Japanese military and naval attaches, correcting that to mean that the Japanese military and naval attaches in Berlin had communicated the matter to the Irmy and Navy in Japan.

Q In other words, regarding military matters you were a mere messenger in the Embassy, conveying information from the German military authorities to the attaches without your taking part in any negotiations regarding them. Is that what you would have us believe?

A You have just spoken of military matters, but the scope is very wide. There are some military matters which it is in the competence of a civil official to handle. On the other hand, there are also military matters of a very specialized nature, genuine military matters which require handling by military men. With respect to such purely genuine military matters, I did, as the prosecutor suggested, act as a sort of messenger boy to the military and naval attaches. I wish further to add, moreover, that as far as most matters were concerned they were discussed and disposed of between the Japanese military and naval attaches and the competent military and naval officials of the German side.

you informed Ribbentrop that you had received from your government instructions which permitted you to concentrate in your hands all questions in regard to the general line of cooperation in a common war

and that only questions of details in the military and economic fields would be dealt with by the military and economic member of the special commission under the Tripartite Pact?

- A 1942, did you say?
- Q Yes.

A I received no such instructions. The German side did desire that I have such instructions, but the system in Japan did not permit of such instructions, and I did not receive any. The general commission, the economic commission, and the military commission were each independent of each other. The general commission could seek the cooperation of the other commissions, but it had no power of direction or command.

Q That was not responsive at all to the question I asked you, and may I remind you of the importance of making your replies applicable specifically to the question that I ask you.

Do you not recall that at the conference I mentioned Ribbentrop said to you that he welcomed the concentration of authority in your hands because it switched the center of gravity of the Tripartite Commission to Berlin?

A I have no exact recollection, but I do know

that Ribbentrop was a man who had such ideas.

Q Well, is it not true that at a conference with Hitler on the following day, 3 January 1942, Hitler stated to you that he would discuss military affairs only with you personally?

A I have no recollection that he said that.

And did you not say to Hitler at this conference that you were empowered by your government to discuss the prosecution of the war with the German Foreign Minister?

A No, I was only empowered with handling the political aspects, and only for the handling of these political aspects was I responsible, and I think naturally I told this to him. If permitted I should like to explain two or three points with regard to the actual situation.

MR. TAVENNER: In regard to what?

THE INTERPRETER: In regard to the actual situation -- then prevailing.

Q I don't think the explanation is necessary unless it is in specific answer to my question as to whether or not you made that statement, but possibly my next question will reach the matter that you have in mind.

Did you not further state to Hitler that

1 2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

21 22

23

24

4

6 7

9 10

11

12

13 14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

while individual questions might be discussed between the army, the airforce, and the navy, it was of prime importance that the principal policy be laid down exclusively by you and the Foreign Minister?

I do not know what expression was used, but I think I said that policy matters were under my charge.

And is this not what was actually done; that is, were not he matters of prime importance and the principal policies settled by you and Ribbentrop?

A We talked, but there was no case of our deciding any new policy.

Q Is it not also true that you stated to Hitler that this same method should be applied to economic and political questions?

Whether I said that or not, I do not recall, but it was within my authority to handle political and economic matters. That is a fact.

General OSHIMA, did not Japan and Germany, prior to Pearl Harbor, exchange raw materials for use in the wars that were being waged by both Japan and Germany?

Yes, but on a very small scale. A

Did not Japan and Germany prior to Pearl Harbor exchange military information and technical

knowledge?

A Not in so far as my participation was concerned. If such exchange did take place it probably took place between the respective armies and navies of both countries.

/ 11

knowledge?

A Not in so far as my participation was concerned. If such exchange did take place it probably took place between the respective armies and navies of both countries.

2.5

Q You state on page 4 of your affidavit that you approved the exchange of culture between Japan and Germany. Did this exchange of culture include scientific knowledge and inventions useful in the waging of war?

A No, those were absolutely not included.

Q Is it not true that many German agents migrated to Japan between 1938 and 1942 in the guise of business men, technicians, advisers, teachers and tourists for the purpose of instructing the Japanese in the Nazi way, economically, politically, and militarily?

A In so far as I know, I know of no case of any Germans being employed to study Nazi methods.

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: In so far as I know, I know of no case in which Germans were employed as teachers in the methods of the Nazis.

A (Continuing) But I knew that some technicians were employed for the purpose of studying technical matters. The period to which you have referred also includes the period during which I was a military attache in Germany. At least during my tenure of office as military attache not one German officer came to Japan as an instructor.

Q Were not many officers in the Japanese Army and Navy sent to Germany for study?

OSHIMA

(

2

4

5

6

9

10

11

13 14

15

16

19

20

18

21

23

24

25

A The Japanese army and navy sent their young officers not only to Germany but to France, to Italy, to the United States, to Great Britain and other countries.

Q And did many of them study at the University of Munich?

A As far as I know, I know of no Japanese officer who studied at a German university.

The MONITOR: Before "officer" insert "army":
"army officer."

What about civilians?

A Civilians studied at various universities. They were not limited to Munich alone.

Q Did they study at Munich?

A There may have been some who studied at Munich University, but they were not limited to that school alone.

Was Karl Haushofer known as the leading German authority on Japan, and were his works read and studied by Japanese both in Germany and in Japan?

A In Germany he was one of those who knew Japan.
I cannot say, however, that his works were read widely
in Japan.

Q Did you not tell Mr. Hyde in your interrogations that his works were read widely by Japanese students in Germany and in Japan?

A His works were widely read by Germans in Japanese to some extent by Japanese in Germany. But his works had no influence whatsoever in Japan, itself.

34,216

Q Is it not true that Haushofer's theory of geopolitics constituted the basis of Nazi philosophy of geographic expansion?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I should like to object. We are getting far afield from the real issues involved in this case. It does not seem as though this matter has any direct bearing on any of the issues involved.

ACTING PRESIDENT: What is the materiality, Mr. Tavenner?

MR. TAVENNER: The materiality is the influence of this notorious leader in German thought upon those in Japan who came in contact with him, which, of course, involves his political thinking and Nazi ideology.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained.

Q In your news article of January 1940, exhibit 3516-A, you refer to the possibility that the Soviet Union desired to reach a rapprochement with Japan in the Far East after the conclusion of the German-Russian Non-Aggression Pact. Do I correctly understand from

this that in January 1940 you favored a rapprochement between Japan and the U.S.S.R.?

3

1

2

5

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

> 19 20

18

21 22

23 24

25

between Japan and the U.S.S.R.?

A I do not quite recall. May I be shown that

article?

Q It is the article which was read to you on

Friday.

A Are you referring to the article in the Dai-Asia Shugi?

Q The one in January 1940, which was the other magazine, I think.

A I have no recollection, but I did desire a rapprochement between the Soviet Union and Japan.

Q Shortly after your return to Germany on your second mission as Ambassador, did you learn of the probability of an attack by Germany on Russia?

A What is the time you are referring to?

Q Well, you returned to Germany as Ambassador in February, 1941. That is the time I am referring to.

A I did not even imagine such a thing at that time.

Q Did you not have a conference with Hitler in February or March, 1941, in which Hitler advised you that Germany would probably attack Russia?

A I had no such conference with him. However, when MATSUOKA came to Berlin, I did not know which it

```
was, whether it was Hitler or Ribbentrop -- one of the
two -- said at a meeting in which I also sat, something
to that effect although very vaguely.

4
5
6
```

CROSS

W

&

L

e f 1

OSHIMA

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

Well, do you not recall that in March, 1941, yoù told YOKOI, your Naval Attache, of a conference you had with Hitler, in which he told you of the German probability of an attack against Russia?

34,219

I probably told him of the conversation that took place between MATSUOKA and the German leaders, but the meaning here is different.

Well, in what way is it different?

It is suggested by what the prosecutor read, as if the German attack on Russia was already decided, but the expression used by Hitler or Ribbentrop, I don't remember which it was, was not that certain. It was very vague.

Aside from any direct statement to you by German officials on that matter, did you not have reason to believe, from the concentration of large bodies of troops on the Russian border and the extensive military preparations then being made, that Germany would probably attack Russia?

A Yes. The reason why I considered the great probability of a war between Germany and the Soviet Union was on the basis of this great increase in forces, but I could not arrive at the conclusion that such movements would inevitably lead to war.

Then, you did consider at this time, did

you not, that while Germany had seemed to desire
Japanese-Russian friendly relations in the past, the
conditions were changing in regard to German-Russian
relations at this time, and so it would be the wise
thing, after all, to consider any proposed nonaggression pact between Japan and Russia?

Probably that question is too long. Let me ask you again.

Is it not true that at this time, that is the latter part of March or the first of April, 1941, that you considered that the relations between Germany and Russia were undergoing a change?

A Yes, that was the impression I had during the latter part of March and the early part of April.

Q I am sorry. I did not get the reply.

(Whereupon, the last answer was

read by the official court reporter.)

Q Then, did you not come to the conclusion

Q Then, did you not come to the conclusion that, in the light of that information or that situation, it would be better to think things over carefully before Japan and Russia should enter into a non-aggression pact?

A I thought that we mustn't be too hasty.

Q And, then, when you accompanied MATSUOKA on the train to the border, when he left Germany for

```
Moscow, you advised him accordingly, didn't you?
 1
                Yes, I did.
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

•

```
After MATSUOKA arrived in Moscow he still
   communicated with you on several occasions regarding
   the progress of the negotiations with Russia for the
  Non-Aggression Pact, didn't he?
             In my recollection I think I received a
 6 telegram twice -- on two occasions.
            Did MATSUOKA always advise you regarding the
 sprogress of his negotiations with other countries?
            No, he did not.
            In testifying on cross-examination, page
11 34,147 of the transcript, you stated that economic
12 matters were entirely in the hands of economic experts,
13 and on the following page you testified that you had
14 almost no knowledge of economics at all. As a matter
of fact, General OSHIMA, were you not very active in
  the field of economic cooperation in the joint pursuit
  of the war?
18
            I do not know exactly what you mean, but with
19
  the progress of the war traffic between Germany and
  apan was completely suspended, and, as a matter of fact,
 there was no economic cooperation between the two
23 countries.
      Q I am speaking of your activities in negotiations
25 relating to economic matters.
```

I handled such matters when instructions came

.

from the Government, but because the actual situation was such in which traffic was completely suspended between the two countries, I have no recollections with regard to my activities in this regard because there was nothing to negotiate about.

Q At the conference of 2 January 1942 with Ribbentrop, did you not present a memorandum suggesting certain concrete negotiations regarding the mutual use of German and Japanese economic power?

A I have no recollection, but I may have done so.

Q Well, do you recall presenting a plan providing for a German credit to Japan of one billion yen and a provisional credit of fifty million yen in order to enable Lapan to obtain machines, armaments and factory equipment?

A I have no recollection and by that I mean that there may have been such. But plans on matters of this kind were entirely prepared and drawn up by the economic section of my embassy and I merely took the matter -- took the document when I approached the competent German officials, so I have no exact recollection.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken

```
until 1100, after which the proceedings were
 1
         resumed as follows:)
 2
 3
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

W.

K p e 3 a u & K n 8

2

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

O General OSHIMA, in presenting this plan of credit, did you not act purely on your own initiative and without any authority of your government?

I have no correct recollection, but that is not quite possible.

Did you learn that Ambassador Ott and Wohltat, on 23 January 1942, questioned your authority to initiate this plan?

Where were Ott and Wohltat at the time? Were they in Japan, or where did they say such a thing?

They were in Japan and telegraphed the information through to Germany.

I have no recollection, but I might refresh my memory if the related documents were shown to me.

Did you ever see the telegram from Ott to Ribbentrop questioning your authority, or did you hear of it through any German sources?

I have neither seen nor heard of it.

Did not MATSU-HIMA, head of the Economic Division, inform Wiehl on 24 January 1942 that you had presented a draft of the economic treaty of assistance

K a 1 p 2 e a 3 u 4 & 5 K 6 n a 7 p 8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

General OSHIMA, in presenting this plan of credit, did you not act purely on your own initiative and without any authority of your government?

A I have no correct recollection, but that is not quite possible.

Q Did you learn that Ambassador Ott and Wohltat, on 23 January 1942, questioned your authority to initiate this plan?

A Where were Ctt and Wohltat at the time? Were they in Japan, or where did they say such a thing?

Q They were in Japan and telegraphed the information through to Germany.

A I have no recollection, but I might refresh my memory if the related documents were shown to me.

Q Did you ever see the telegram from Ott to Ribbentrop questioning your authority, or did you hear of it through any German sources?

A I have neither seen nor heard of it.

O Did not MATSUSHIMA, head of the Economic Division, inform Wiehl on 24 January 1942 that you had presented a draft of the economic treaty of assistance

without the approval of your government, because you believed that it would unduly delay the credit arrangement if the consent of the Japanese Government would have to be obtained first?

CROSS

4

5

8

A It is a fact that Minister MATSUSHIMA was in charge of economic questions in the Embassy, and was drawing up various plans, but I do not recall the contents. But, assuming that this was so, it is quite possible to say that the German side was saying such a thing for the purpose of bargaining --

10

12

13

14

15

16

SHIMA, who was in charge of economic affairs in the Embassv, was carrying on negotiations with the German side, but I do not recall the contents of it. Assuming that such a thing did happen, it is quite possible for such statements -- for such matters being brought up in bargaining with the German side, but I cannot give you any definite views on my own part.

17

18

19

20

Q I am asking you this specific question: Did you or did you not present that plan of economic assistance without authority from your government being first obtained?

21

A I have no recollection, and furthermore there would be no possibility of occasion for such.

Q At a conference on 23 March 1942 did you and

23

24

Ribbentrop discuss future economic cooperation between the European-African sphere under the leadership of Germany and Italy on the one side, and the East Asia sphere under the leadership of Japan on the other side?

A I have no recollection.

Q Do you not recall that in your conference you contemplated the establishment of a great economic agreement between the three powers, aimed at establishing advantages and privileges for Japan, Germany and Italy to the evolution of the United States as much as possible?

A I have no recollection.

Q Do you recall that at a conference between you and Ribbentrop on 9 May 1942, the position was taken by Ribbentrop that the Tripartite Pact was the starting point for all political and econimic discussions and plans for international relations, even after the period of the war?

A He may have, but I have no recollection.

Q Do you not recall that you enthusiastically concurred in this statement by Ribbentrop?

A I have no recollection.

O Did you not envisage the waging of war with the United States in the field of economy by Japanese, German and Italian boycott to be enforced after the

2

4

6

8

9

11

12 13

15

14

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

34,228

shooting war ended?

A I have no recollection of that.

Q In this conference of May 9, 1942, did you not discuss the facilitation of economic cooperation between the two great economic areas defined in the Tripartite Pact, by the establishment of a strict control of the economy of those nations?

A No, I have no recollection.

Q Didn't your discussion even extend to the question of how you would control the economy of independent states which were located within the various spheres defined under the Tripartite Pact?

A There would be no occasion for discussing such a thing.

Q I am not asking you as to whether or not there would be an occasion; I am asking you if you did not discuss those very matters.

A In my recollection -- according to my recollection there was no such a discussion.

Q Did not your discussion go to the extent that it involved a plan on the part of the Axis Powers to exert influence on the independent states in such a way as to compel regulation of their individual economies?

A I have no recollection of ever having discussed such a matter.

4

2

3

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24

a Did not you and Ribbentrop at this conference agree that in so far as the United States and Central and South American countries were concerned a binding arrangement should be made that after the war the resumption and continuation of economic relations should only take place after mutual agreement between Japan, Germany, and Italy?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is objected to as immaterial and going far beyond the issues involved in this case.

MR. TAVENNER: My reply, if the Tribunal please, is that there was no limit to the extent the Tripartite Pact went under its terms and under the construction that was being given it by some of these accused.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled. BY MR. TAVENNER:

O Please answer.

A I have no recollection. It all appears to be very abstract and pertaining to the future, and I have no recollection of ever having discussed such matters seriously.

O I hand you exhibit 50 in the Japanese text, which is an announcement by the Board of Information of the agreement between Japan and Germany concerning

econ

3

5

,

7 8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

economic cooperation. It wasn't read in evidence.
Will you glance at this document and tell me whether
you signed the agreement referred to therein in
behalf of Japan, and the date you signed it.

(Whereupon, the witness examined the document.)

A mere glance at that document ought to be sufficient, General OSHIMA.

A I recall that there was an economic agreement similar to what is referred here. It is also true that all economic agreements signed in Germany were signed on my responsibility.

0 Well, did you sign it?

A I think I signed it. I did not handle economic negotiations, but I had the responsibility for them. By merely looking at this I don't recall the date.

O Is that the same economic agreement of assistance to which you referred in your affidavit as having been concluded in January, 1943?

A I think so probably, but I have no definite recollection. As I have stated in my affidavit, I don't recall the contents.

Now, there is nothing said in that announcement from the Bureau of Information, as shown in exhibit

50, of the existence of any secret terms or agreements.

5

6

11

12

15

19

Do you know whether there was a secret protocol? 1 A I don't think there was any secret agreement 2 attached to an economic agreement. 3 O Do you not know, as a matter of fact, that there was a secret protocol? I have no recollection. o Well, I will see after lunch if I can present it to you to refresh your recollection both as to the fact of such a secret protocol and its contents, and then I may desire to ask you further questions about it. After MATSUOKA's return to Japan in April, 13 1941, were you aware that talks were conducted between 14 Japan and the United States? I received notification for the first time 16 on the 1st of May --THE INTERPRETER: Correction: in the latter 18 part of May. That is not an answer to my question. didn't ask you when you received official notification; I asked you if you were aware that talks were being conducted.

23

No, I did not know.

24 25

O Then did you first learn that?

As I have already replied, the latter part of

May.

O Did you not oppose the diplomatic policy of MATSUOKA with regard to the United States?

A I did not oppose it.

O Did you not inform MATSUOKA that in your opinion Japan would lose the chance to establish her right for leadership in East Asia if Japan concluded the anticipated agreement with the United States?

A No, I have not stated anything to him in that manner. I have sent him my opinions.

Greenberg & Yelden

2

3

4

5

: 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Q Well, did you send him your opinion in that manner?

A No.

Q Did you not submit to MATSUOKA two plans that you prepared from the German viewpoint, one of which contemplated the refusal of the American proposal and the other of which would have bound the United States to abandon the convoy patrol plan?

A Yes, I did.

Q Did you not also remind MATSUOKA that the European war was developing favorably for Germany and Italy and in a few months very important developments were expected?

A Yes, I did.

Q And then did you not urge MATSUOKA that if at that time Japan should lose the confidence and trust of Germany and Italy it would be very unfortunatofor Japan?

A I said something to that effect to him but there were some preliminary remarks before that.

Q Did you not also suggest to MATSUCKA that his policy was a two-faced diplomacy which would lead Japan to an absolute international isolation during the critical period which may arise after the war?

A I did not say that MATSUOKA's policy was a

114

·17

16

19 20

21 22

23

19

two-faced diplomacy, but I did say that such would be the result if he did undertake to pursue a two-faced diplomacy.

Q And you were doing all you could in the presentation of your views to MATSUOKA to discourage and defeat a rapprochement between Japan and the United States, didn't you?

A No, that is not so; that is entirely contrary to the facts.

Q Well, did you not explain to MATSUOKA your
apprehension that should Japan lose this opportunity
to erpand southward and the possibility of attacking
Singapore she would invite the contempt of not only
America and England but also Germany and Italy? Didn't
you urge that explanation in order to discourage
negotiations between Japan and the United States?

A I have made no efforts to discourage anything.

I informed him of the matters just suggested by you

out there were important premises, preliminary remarks,

pefore that.

Q Did you not charge that if MATSUOKA persisted in his policy it would mean that Japan had abandoned her great mission to establish a new order in the Great East Asia?

A I did not say that the mission would be

 abandoned if MATSUOKA's diplomacy were continued. The opinion which I sent to him was to secure the neutrality of the United States and to seek a rapprochement with that country.

Q Did you not then call upon MATSUOKA to establish the idea of the Tri-Partite Pact by upholding the principle that Japan is to facilitate the battle of Germany and Italy against Britain?

A This was Japan's natural obligations under the Tri-Partite Pact, and for this purpose it was necessary to have the United States remain neutral and to do this was Japan's obligations under the terms of the pact. As an ambassador in Germany I was instructed to act with the Tri-Partite Pact as the standard and it was therefore naturally my obligation to see to it that Japan did not violate that obligation.

In other words, you undertook to control the diplomacy of the Japanese Government by your communications to MATSUOKA, didn't you?

A No, not so.

Q Now, in the early part of May 1941 -- just before I ask you that question I want to ask you one more relating to the matters I just discussed.

With regard to these matters that I have asked

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

63

you about did you not state to MATSUOKA, "I beg you to take these circumstances under consideration"?

I sent the wire to Mr. MATSUOKA with the intention that he would give it his consideration.

MR. TAVENNER: I respectfully refer the Tribunal to exhibit 1075, pages 9918 to 9932 of the transcript.

Q Now, is it not true that early in May 1941 MATSUOKA contemplated a trip to the United States regarding these matters we have discussed?

A I do not know.

I hand you prosecution document 1383, telegram 480, purporting to be a telegram of May 4, 1941 from you to the Foreign Minister marked "Secret." Will you please examine it and state whether or not it was sent by you or under your direction?

Of course, this message was sent out from the Japanese Embassy in Berlin and naturally, therefore, it would come under my direction, but this is purely rumor.

MR. TAVENNER: I offer in evidence prosecution exhibit 1383.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Prosecution document you mean, do you not? It is admitted in evidence. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document

24

1383F(1) will receive exhibit No. 3518. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3518 and received in evidence.)

MR. TAVENNER: I will read the body of the exhibit:

"A rumor that Foreign Minister MATSUO.TA is planning to go to the U.S.A. was lately in circulation here and Domei, on 30 April, carried the talk of Spokesman ISHII of the Information Bureau to the effect that Germany and Italy should be asked whether they would object to the Foreign Minister's trip to the U.S. and that the U.S. is a neutral nation concerning the European War and is not in hostility with Germany and Italy. This gave the people such an impression that the said rumor is well-grounded. It is now common sense that the U.S.A. has become a completely hostile country against Germany and Italy by giving aids to Britain in such a way as regarded to be near her actual participation in war.

"At this time when the German papers are severely attacking Britain as well as the U.S.A., the German Government has made no expression of her will outwardly on this rumor and the papers are keeping silence. It can be judged, however, that they evidently have great concern inwardly. I ask you, therefore, to inform me of the truth by return cable."

Q Who was your military attache in May, 1941?

A I think it was Lieutenant General BANZAI.

Q Did you discuss with him your objection to MATSUOKA's proposed visit to the United States?

A I have not objected to the proposed visit.

Q Well, did you discuss the question of the visit with BANZAI?

A I have no recollection.

Q Did you convey any information to your military attache such as would lead him to the conclusion that there was a possibility of your resignation as Ambassador?

A Absolutely not.

Q I hand you prosecution document 1383B(9) (handing). What is it?

A This is a telegram sent by the military attache to the General Staff Office. I have no knowledge of this whatsoever, nor is there anything intimated here with regard to my intentions of resigning. The military attache on his own entertained a feeling whether such a thing would not come to pass. It was something that I knew nothing about.

Q That is, if mATSUOKA took his proposed trip to the United States.

A No, not so. This was written by BANZAI; and for what reason and ith what meaning he wrote,

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2

23

I do not know.

2

3

4

5

_

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

24 25 Q Does that document bear the seal of the Foreign Office in Japan?

A No. This was something with which the Foreign Office was not connected at all.

Q Is it initialed in ink by Vice-Minister OHASHI of the Foreign Office?

A This appears to be a document sent by the Army to the Foreign Office for reference. This document itself is not of the form which normally and originally is that of the Foreign Office.

Q But it shows by the information on it that it was from the Foreign Office, does it not?

A No. This is an army telegram.

Q I asked you whether or not it was initialed in ink by OHASHI.

A I do not see it. Well, there is a Foreign Office seal on this document, but this is an army telegram, and I think that it was referred by the army to the Foreign Office for reference. It says "Vice-Minister" here, and it may be Mr. OHASHI saw the telegram, but I cannot say.

Q Whose first name appears after that statement?

A No, no one's name is written here. No, I

can't fell. I can't say.

.

R. TAVENNER: I offer the document in evidence.

that the document is not properly identified and is not binding upon this defendant, this accused.

ACTING PRESIDENT: As I understand it, he has testified that this comes from his office in Berlin.

AR. CUNNINGHAM: It is not my understanding, your Honor. My understanding is that it is a telegram from BANZAI, the military attache to the General Staff. It is no responsibility of the accused.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

please, that the identification would have to rest upon the theory, as previously shown by the witnesses for this accused, that the military attache was required under his duties to discuss matters of policy with the Ambassador and communicate those views to the General Staff.

R. CUNNINGHAM: It is suggested, your Honor, that the record does not bear out that last statement. That is not a true statement of the

situation, that the matters of military were separate from the matters of political in the Embassy in Berlin.

involved in the matter we are now discussing, and it would seem to me to be a question of whether or not this witness is bound by the acts of the military attache in the light of General KAWABE's statement as to the duty of a military attache.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objections are sustained and the document is rejected.

We will now adjourn until one-thirty.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess

was taken.)

r h

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330. MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far Last is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: With the Tribunal's permission, the accused TOGO will be absent from the courtroom the whole of the afternoon session conferring with his counsel.

Mr. Tavenner.

11 12

10

6

HIROSHI OSHIMA, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters

14

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued)

as follows:

MR. TAVENNER: Mr. Marshal, will you hand to the witness IPS document 1383F (2)?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Is that a reply from the Foreign Minister to your wire of May 4 regarding MATSUOKA's trip to the United States? From Foreign Minister MATSUOKA to you as ambassador?

Yes, this is.

MR. TAVENNER: I offer this document in evidence.
ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be received in evi-

dence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 1383F

(2) will receive exhibit No. 3519.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 3519 and received in evidence.)

MR. TAVENN R: I will read exhibit 3519: "Re: Your telegram No. 480.

"Concerning this matter, I have received several inquiries since some time ago from the German and Italian Ambassadors in Japan. Though the United States might presumably want me to visit America, I have no such intention. I replied to both Ambassadors to this effect and had them cable to that effect to their governments respectively.

"Furthermore, when I was asked questions by
Japanese pressmen at Kyoto on the 4th regarding my trip
to Ise Shrine, I answered that, since I was very well
acquainted with matters concerning the United States,
there was no necessity for me to visit there, but on the
contrary, I would rather have President Roosevelt and
Secretary Hull visit Japan, to rectify their cognizance
of Japan. This is reported to you for your information.

34,245

	"Please let both attaches know about this
matt	er."
	Q General OSHIMA, did you let Attache BANSAI
know	about the message from MATSUOKA?
	A I have no recollection but I think I naturally
info	rmed him of it.
	Q When you informed him of it didn't you discuss
with	him the reason for the message from MATSUOKA to
him,	and did you not then learn that BANZAI had sent
thro	ugh a message to Japan regarding this matter?
	A I did not. The reply from the Foreign Office
was	to my telegram and I presume that I showed it to
the	two attaches.
	Q But that does not answer my question. Did you
not	discuss with BANZAI
	A No, I did not talk with him about it.
	Q Before lunch I told you that I would present
to y	ou a copy of the secret protocol in connection with
	Economic Agreement for Assistance between Japan and
	many. I now hand you IPS document 889 consisting
	German draft and Italian draft correction, please
	sisting of the text in both German and Japanese.
	(Whereupon, a document was handed

Q (Continuing) Are those documents marked "top

24

to the witness.)

2.5

secret"?

2

1

4

6

7

5

8

9

11

13

14

15 16

17 18

20

19

22

24 25 A No, there is no seal but it is printed on there.

Q Do you recognize those papers as being the copy of the secret protocol?

A Will you wait just a moment? Yes, I do.

MR. TAVENNER: I desire to offer in evidence the Japanese copy handed to the witness.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Object to the introduction of this document for the reason that it isn't properly identified, is not shown to have been known to this witness, and the witness, therefore, is not bound thereby.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The witness just admitted it as an authentic copy, did he not?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Objection overruled. The document will be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 889 will receive exhibit No. 3520.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 3520 and received in evidence.)

MR. TAVENNER: I will read in evidence only portions of this supplementary protocol.

S	C	C	r	e	t	11	•

A No, there is no seal but it is printed on there.

Q Do you recognize those papers as being the copy of the secret protocol?

A Will you wait just a moment? Yes, I do.

MR. TAVENNER: I desire to offer in evidence the Japanese copy handed to the witness.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Object to the introduction of this document for the reason that it isn't properly identified, is not shown to have been known to this witness, and the witness, therefore, is not bound thereby.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The witness just admitted it as an authentic copy, did he not?

MR. TAVENNER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Objection overruled. The document will be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 889 will receive exhibit No. 3520.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 3520 and received in evidence.)

MR. TAVENNER: I will read in evidence only portions of this supplementary protocol.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Can we get a copy of the English translation

MR. TAV NNER: We have endeavored to have them made but they haven't arrived in the courtroom yet. What I have is a typewritten copy. I have one extra copy which I would be very glad to hand to the President of the Tribunal.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the Acting President.)

MR. CUNNINCHAM: If your Honor please, I would like to object to this procedure for the reason we don't have a copy, we can't follow the translation and can't even determine whether or not the translation is correct.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I think it would be better if we all had copies when this is read.

MR. TAVENNER: I am informed that the processed copies will be here this afternoon, and I will gladly postpone reading the document until they arrive.

OSHIMA

3

4

.

7

8

10 11

12 13

15 16

17 18

22

21

24

Q And was it not suggested by Ribbentrop that the cooperation should be in the same manner as was

recollection whether he said that.

and Bulgaria?

A We discussed the matter but I do not have any

Q Well, did you not state that you intended to create a plan for more intensive Japanese propaganda?

A I do not recall that either. My reason for so stating is that such matters were brought up for discussion, but because they were not carried out they do not remain in my memory.

Q Well, you do recall, do you not, that you set up a newspaper division within the embassy and Minister SAKUMA was brought over from Japan to take

Q General OSHIMA, did you discuss plans with Ribbentrop on 23 February 1941 for close cooperation in all spheres of activity in carrying on the war?

in all spheres of activity in carrying on the war?

A I conferred with him on the 23d, but whether or not I discussed such a question as just suggested

by you I do not know, unless, perhaps, you give me some more concrete details of the discussion.

Q Well, were not plans discussed particularly with regard to news services and newspapers?

A Yes, that came up for discussion.

the cooperation should be in the same manner as was already being done in Italy, Rumania, Hungary, Slovakia

14

20

19

23

charge of it?

1

2

.

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

23

24

25

A It is a fact that Minister SAKUMA came to the Japanese Embassy as chief of the press division, but he did not come for that purpose.

Q Well, that was what you used him for, wasn't it?

A He did that as a part of his work.

Q And the result of your propaganda work in the embassy in Berlin was distributed and made use of in Japan also, was it not?

A It has never been sent to Japan.

Q Well, what was the source of the information that you used in this propaganda?

A Publicity activities were actually not carried out. We only gave general information which came from Japan to the news agencies in Germany.

Q Well, toward the last of Merch, 1941, did you discuss a general plan of extension in Japan of the propaganda idea with Ambassador Ott who had been called back to Germany during the MATSUOKA conférences?

A Are you referring to importing the German method of propaganda into Japan?

Q Let us first answer the question generally.

Did you discuss propaganda in Japan with General Ott?

A I have no recollection. That question may

have been broached because he came back to Germany, but I have no recollection of any conversation on that.

Q Reference is made to exhibit 571, page 6,456 of the transcript. In your discussions with Ambassador Ott did you not approve a plan drafted by the German Foreign Ministry which in part provided for the building of a demonstration hall in Tokyo?

A I have no recollection. However, I should like to state that because there was a project under discussion with reference to the erection of a Japan-German Association building in Japan, and the subject may have been brought up in connection with that subject. But I have no recollection of hearing anything about what you call a demonstration hall.

Q Was not the purpose of intensification of propaganda to improve the minds of the Japanese people for cooperation with Germany?

A It was to foster good will between Germany and Jepan.

Q Did you have a conversation with Ribbentrep shortly prior to 4 January 1942 regarding the question of cooperation between the Axis Powers and Japan in the field of propaganda directed especially toward India and the Arabian countries?

4 5

I recall that some discussion came up in connection with India and other countries, but none of the things which we discussed were ever carried 4 out. I have no recollection of the contents. Q Was not a joint military commission set up 6 in December 1941 to decide matters of tactics and 7 operations? A In 1941 did you say? Q Yes. I did not participate in the establishment of the military commission, and as far as I know I have heard nothing about this commission. 13 Q Possibly you may recall --14 THE INTERPRETER: Just a moment. Correction as to the latter part of the witness! reply: As far as I know I have not heard that it was held. A (Continuing) I should like to inquire again, 18 are you referring to the military commission? I am referring to the commission of which 20 Admirals NOMURA and YOKOI and Lieutenant General BANZAI 21 were the Japanese members, and Field Marshal Kaitel

and Admiral Doenitz the German representatives.

the Italian representatives are not mentioned in

I have never heard of it. And I should like

to add that this was not a military commission because

connection with it.

Q Well, if not a commission under the Tripartite Pact was it, nevertheless, a committee or commission which did act upon matters of tactics and operations?

A Such persons often met, but this was something entirely outside of the scope of my duties, and they had no responsibility of reporting to me. This group should not be called a military commission. They merely undertook discussion of routine matters between the Japanese military and naval attaches and the military and naval authorities on the German side.

Q Then there was the military agreement between Japan, Germany, and Italy of 18 January 1942, dividing the world into two zones for military and naval operations; was there not?

A This was a purely military agreement, and I as a civil official had nothing to do with it, and therefore I do not know anything of its contents.

Q Is it not true that a common code was arranged for the use of the Japanese and German navies?

A Well, after the agreement was concluded I heard informally that methods of communications had been decided upon, but I did not receive this information from any responsible source or official.

Q In a conference between you and Hitler on

3 January 1942 were you informed of the German invention of a new armor-piercing hollow grenade, and was it not offered by Hitler to Japan?

A That is a little different, but there was some talk of a matter of a similar nature. That talk was that a new shell which was capable of piercing a tank had been created, and that this new shell was to be presented to Japan. I talked of this matter to the military attache, and all negotiations thereafter with the German Army were conducted by the military attache, and therefore I am unfamiliar with the details. But I did hear that this shell was given to Japan.

Q Did Hitler stress to you the importance of exchange of military discoveries between Japan and Germany?

A I have no recollection, but I think that he entertained such ideas.

Well, did you not enthusiastically agree with this idea, and did you not state that the Japanese Army was skilled in landing operations, having carried them out for fifty years, and offer to place at the disposal of the German Army Japanese officers who were experts on landing operations?

A I have no recollection, but inasmuch as

the carrying out of joint operations had been de-

3

2

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

24

25

cided upon I presume as a matter of course I mentioned something to that effect.

Did you . pt also express the opinion that the Japanese Army would seek to occury Burma and you considered it important in this connection that Germany and Japan make a joint declaration against India?

Did you say a joint declaration, a joint statement?

Yes. Q

I have no recollection.

Did you not say that once English bases in India were eliminated Japan could easily send convoys to the Persian Gulf?

A I have no recollection. By saying so I mean that whenever I mot Hitler I was asked by the army -- military and naval attaches were unable to see him -- to say such and such a thing to him and was requested by these two attaches to bring up certain matters before the Fuehrer; and therefore I may have said such's thing to Hitler, but at this date I do not have any exact recollection.

Q And did you not at the conclusion of the conference express the hope that Germany and Japan would enter into close cooperation after the war?

A I have no recollection, but I probably did so. I think it was but natural for me to make such a statement.

Q Do you recall Hitler stating to you that this was probably the first time in history that two so powerful military powers that were situated far apart from each other were engaged in battle jointly?

A Well, this was something that was talked about five or six years ago. It was not an important matter, and he may have said so, but I do not recall.

Well, in this connection did he not state that this situation created the possibility, through exact 2 timing of operations, of producing a smoke screen over military activity which must have a considerable reaction 3 on the enemy, as the latter would be forced as a result to keep shifting his main effort, and in this way to

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I ask that the previous question and answer be repeated. There is a misinterpretation which goes to the heart of the question. It is interpreted as though OSHIMA said what was alleged, and the question was concerning what Hitler said.

MR. TAVENNER: I, of course, meant Hitler. That ought to clear it up.

I have no recollection.

scatter his forces hopelessly?

Did you not tell Ribbentrop on 6 March 1943 that in the near future Japanese officers, clothed as couriers and embassy secretaries, would come to Berlin from Tokyo to deliver particulars concerning the military situation and the Japanese forces and plans?

I do not recall whether I said this or not, but such persons did come.

And did they deliver the plans and particulars to the German Government?

They didn't bring any plans with regard to

11 12

5

6

8

9

10

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

future operations; and, furthermore, this was a matter outside of my province of duties. What I heard of was the economic conditions in Japan, and what I felt was necessary was reported to the German Government.

Military matters were conveyed by the Japanese military and naval attaches to the German army and navy authorities. But with regard to secret matters or with regard to plans for the future, from what I heard later, nothing of the kind was brought up by the Japanese

Q In your conference with Hitler on 3 January 1942, did he discuss with you the naval war situation in the Atlantic?

A There were no occasions for a discussion. But at this date I do not recollect whether I heard anything of the kind.

Q And aid he not state that the most important task was to get the submarine war going at full blast?

A Do you mean the German side?

attaches with the German side.

Q Both the German and the Japanese side.

A I have no recollection that anything of that kind was said in 1942.

Q Well, did he confine it, then, to either the German or the Japanese side getting the submarine war into full blast?

@

 OSHIMA

3

5

.

9

11

13

16 17

15

19

20

21

18

22

23

24

25

A No, not so. But later, in 1943, he advised whether or not Japan wouldn't do that also, participate in such warfare also; but I never heard of anything like that brought up in 1942.

Q Do you not recall that on January 3, 1942, he said to you that merchant vessels were being sunk by Germany without warning in order that as many as possible of the crew should perish?

A I recall that Hitler said something about annihilating crews of merchant vessels. But that was what Germany alone intended to do and was -- But that was a matter which Germany alone was thinking about, and was not recommended to Japan.

Q And did not Hitler express the idea also that this course would cause America to have difficulty in recruiting crews because of the time required to train seafaring personnel?

A I recall him saying something to the effect that replacements would become difficult.

- Q And did not Hitler also say that he had ordered his submarines to surface after torpedoing and shooting up the lifeboats?
 - A I have no recollection of his saying that.
- Q General OSHIMA, did you not concur in these statements of Hitler, and did you not say that the

Japanese were forced to follow these methods?

A I did not say anything of the kind.

Q Did you not have a conference with Ribbentrop on 9 July 1942, at which he urged Japan to send more submarines as well as cruisers and other large units to the Indian Ocean to intercept supplies for the British in Egypt?

A I have no recollection. That is to say, in Germany Ribbentrop was in a position to attend military conferences. But on the Japanese side, such matters were entirely outside of my scope of duties and authority. If, however, assuming that he said so, I would naturally have transmitted such matters to the naval attache. At this date I have no recollection.

Q Maybe this will refresh your recollection:

Lo you not recall that you advised Ribbentrop
that the English and American reinforcements to Egypt
were being impeded by the activity of Japanese submarines?

A I have no recollection on that either. If assuming that I said so, then the naval attache for Japan may have asked me to convey the matter. I say this because, being a civil official, I was not receiving any official report as to the location of Japanese submarines.

Q Did you not agree with Ribbentrop that you would pass these suggestions on to Tokyo?

A I may have done so, but the channel through which such reports were transmitted was from the Japanese mayal attache to the naval authorities in Tokyo.

Q Regardless of the channel that was used, did you, in passing on these suggestions, recommend their acceptance?

A No, that is not so. Such matters were entirely handled by the naval attache. I merely transmitted information to him. To explain further, even in Tokyo the Foreign Office did not in any manner handle such matters.

2.5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

OSHIMA

Q Were you informed that prior to February 26, 1943, Admiral NOMURA stated to German officials that the Japanese Navy was planning to use submarines against merchant shipping, and that he had asked you and Foreign Minister Ribbentrop to request that two German submarines be put at Japan's disposal?

A I heard that the Japanese Navy desired the transfer of the German submarines to Japan, but I never heard anything about torpedoing merchant shipping. I think the Germans were already torpedoing merchant ships at the time.

Q I think possibly you misunderstood my question. Were you informed that Admiral NOMURA stated to German officials that the Japanese Navy was planning to use submarines against merchant shipping and wanted two submarines from Germany for that purpose?

A Then there seems to be two questions. Does the first part of your question mean using submarines as cargo vessels; and the other question that Japan wished to have two German submarines?

Q It relates to the use of German submarines in the sinking of merchant shipping and also Japan's request for two submarines to be placed at Japan's disposal.

A I heard of the desire to have two submarines,

1

0

21

23

24

but

but I heard nothing about submarine warfare.

Q You heard nothing about the use of the submarines against merchant shipping, is that what I understand?

A I never heard of it, but I presume that both Japan and the United States were already doing that.

Q Were you not informed that Hitler favored the idea of releasing one submarine, but that he would not decide the matter until he was officially asked to do so?

A No, I heard nothing about it.

Q Well, now, on the 6th of March, 1943, at a conference with Ribbentrop did you not state that the Japanese Government intended to increase the submarine shipping attacks and would immediately set about making the necessary preparations?

A 1 may have, but if I did so I was conveying the intentions of the Japanese Navy.

Q And did you not mention the fact that Japanese submarines were at that time not suited for shipping attacks and that the Navy had to revamp its construction program?

A I may have and if I did I was conveying the message of the naval authorities. I have no definite recollection as to that. Being an ambassador stationed abroad, I knew nothing about submarine construction and

```
so, if I did say anything of the kind, I was conveying
     the message of the Japanese naval authorities.
2
3
4
5
6
7
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Q Well, you recall this, do you not, that you stated that the Japanese Navy would be grateful if it could obtain two submarines from the German Navy?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I object to further discussion of this question. It seems like an utter waste of time to spend so much time concerning two submarines in a period after the war had begun, or the diplomatic conversations concerning them. It certainly has no materiality or relevancy to the main issue involved in this case -- plans and preparations for a campaign.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It was not only plans and preparations, but the waging of an aggressive war. Objection overruled.

A I said that the Japanese Navy desired the transfer of two German submarines.

Q And, did not Ribbentrop agree with you and state that he would speak to Admiral Doenitz about it?

A I do not know what Ribbentrop actually said -told Doenitz, if he did, because after that the
matter was entirely transferred into the hands of
the Naval Attache, who conducted his negotiations
with the German Navy. I presume Ribbentrop may have

said that, but I do not know.

Q Well, let's see if a good many things didn't occur before the matter was turned over to Admiral NOMURA.

Do you not recall that on the same day,
6 March 1943, Ribbentrop again summoned you to a
conference and explained to you that the German
Government, after consultation with the Navy, was
prepared to place one or two U-boats at the disposal
of the Japanese Navy?

A Ribbentrop had already once before -- quite a while before already said that Germany was prepared to give Japan one or two submarines, but I have no recollection whether he repeated that again on this occasion you are referring to.

Q Well, is it not a fact that at this time he further stated to you that the German Government offered these submarines on condition that the Japanese Navy tackle immediately submarine construction on a large scale and carry mass production into effect?

A I do not now recall what Ribbentrop later said, but in connection with the transfer of the German submarines to Japan, no conditions were attached. Ribbentrop expressed the German desire that Japan utilize submarines for the purpose of

7 8

5 6

9

10 11

12 13

14 15

17

19 20

22 a

Reference exhibit No. 179-I, paragraph 2, 25 record page 1938, lines 11 to 13: Delete "The army is so strongly determined in its positive policy

destroying lines of communications and also the hope that Japan would expand the construction of submarines, but he did not attach any conditions with the presentation of the U-boats.

At about that time, there was a distinct change in policy in Japanese naval warfare, was there not, which placed emphasis upon the destruction of tonnage or, in other words, tonnage warfare?

That was something with which the ambassador had no connections whatsoever and was never informed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International 18 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Captain Kraft.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Captain Kraft): If the Tribunal please, the following language correction is submitted:

8

n 16

K

K a

p 1

towards Manchuria the orders given by the central authorities may not be carried out" and substitute 2 "The determination of the military circles towards Manchuria is so strong that it is feared that orders given by the central authorities may not be thoroughly understood."

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

CROSS

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I will ask the clerk to distribute now the copies of exhibit 3520. I will read from this exhibit certain portions, as follows:

"Article 2. For carrying through Article 2 of the Agreement, Germany and Japan will guarantee mutually for three years means of payment to the amount of 586 million Reichsmarks and of a thousand million yen.

"Article 3. Each of the contracting parties will in its economic activities in the economic sphere of the other party respect the guidance of the other.

"Article A. The contracting parties will, in the building up of their interior economic sphere and in economic exchange between the economic spheres of both sides, respect with the utmost goodwill the needs of the other party in any case in preference to the needs of lands outside the two economic spheres of the contracting parties. In the same way the contracting parties will treat goods from the other contracting

10

11 12

13

16

17

18

19 20

21

OSHIMA CROSS 34,268

party's economic sphere, as far as possible more favorably compared with gor's from lands outside the two economic spheres.

"Article 7. The contracting parties will, in the territories militarily occupied by them, grant the protection to those nationals and firms of the other party which have hitherto engaged in international trade that flows from the spirit of the Tripartite Pact between Germany, Italy, and Japan of 27 September 1940 corresponding to the 27th day of the ninth month of the fifteenth year of the Showa Era, will accord preferential protection over the nationals and firms of countries outside the two economic spheres.

"7ith regard to detailed agreements after the end of this war the contracting parties are to consult each other.

"Article 8. At the end of this war the contracting parties will resume economic relations with such
states as were at war with them or which had broken
off diplomatic relations, only after mutual consultations.

"Article 9. The contracting parties will take the foregoing principles into consideration in their treaty agreements with each other as well as with the remaining independent states of the economic spheres

and in this way so far as possible work toward having these principles respected by the other independent states in their economic spheres.

"Should one of the two contracting parties reach treaty accords with independent states of the other economic spheres, it should consult in advance with the other party about it.

"Article 11. This protocol has the force of an inseparable constituent part of the treaty between Germany and Japan on economic cooperation. It shall, however, be kept secret."

General OSHIMA, that is the secret protocol to the agreement between Germany and Japan concerning economic cooperation, is it not?

A That is what I think, but as I have told you before, I have no sure recollection concerning this.

Near the top of page 36 of your affidavit you state that Germany first officially requested Japanese participation in the war against Russia in the summer of 1943. Was it not in the summer of 1942?

A I think the I . official representation from termany on this matter and the last time that Japan officially denied this request was in 1943 -- in the summer of 1943.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I would suggest the question

2

OSHIMA

4

5

7

0

10

11

12

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

was a misquotation of the affidavit.

MR. TAVENNER: The affidavit speaks for itself.

I am referring to the last line in the top paragraph
on page 36.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The point was, your Honor, that the discussion starts on page 35, and the connotation of the quotation is incorrect. If you start at No. 2 on page 35 and carry it down to the bottom of the paragraph on page 36, you get the full sense and not an isolated sentence which carries a different meaning from what the paragraph really means.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I do not see any misunderstanding.

BY MR. TAVENNER:

OSHIMA

Your affidavit plainly states that the official request, you thought, was in the summer of 1943. I am asking you if that is not a mistake and that it was actually in the summer of 1942.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I must object for the reason that that is not a proper quotation of the affidavit. You get an entirely different question.

ACTING PRESIDENT: As I understand the affi-12 davit, it says that this official request was last made in 1943. As I understood the prosecutor's question: 14 Did you not make a mistake and mean in 1942 when the last 15 request was made?

MR. TAVENNER: I think I can clear it up by asking a very simple question in another way.

When was the first official request made for Japanese participation in the Russo-German War?

Only one official request was made. At that time the request was made in the name of the government.

And was not that official request made in the summer of 1942, and not in the summer of 1943 as stated by you in your affidavit?

According to my recollection, I think it was

11

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

the summer of 1943.

2

3

4

)

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

10

19

21

23

25

Q Well, let me read to you your answer on this matter in your interrogation by Mr. Hyde on 5 March 1946, which is as follows:

CROSS

"In the summer of 1942, Germany officially requested Japan to enter into the Soviet War."

Does this not refresh your memory as to the correct time?

A According to my recollection, I still think that 1943 is correct.

Q Were you not in favor of a Japanese attack on Russia prior to the summer of 1942?

A I never once expressed an opinion in favor of such an act.

MR. TAVENNER: I am sorry; will you repeat the answer, please?

(Whereupon, the last answer of the witness was read by the official court reporter.)

Q I asked you if you were in favor of a Japanese attack on Russia prior to the summer of 1942.

A No, I was not. Feveral times I did convey German desires in this regard, previously.

Well, prior to the summer of 1942, which may have been the time of the making of the official request, did you not have numerous conferences with various German

officials regarding the progress of the war against Russia?

3

6

8

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

17

20 21

22

23 24

25

A Regarding the progress of the war against
Russia, I gained my information through two channels;
first, the army from its own standpoint gained informa-

tion from the German Army, and secondly, I gained my information from talks with Ribbentrop regarding the German-Soviet War. Only once, I believe it was either toward the end of July or the beginning of August 1942, when -- 1941, when I asked Ribbentrop concerning the

progress of the war against Russia, he called Marshal Keitel in and had him explain the war situation.

Q Well, did you speak to any other German afficials about the progress of the war in Russia, other than Ribbentrop and Keitel? And by "officials" I mean civilian as well as military officials.

A Of course, I did hear secondhand from the Military Attache what he was able to hear from the German Army, but I myself personally never heard anything from the German Army except from Keitel.

Q That was not an answer at all to my question.

Did you discuss the progress of the German-Russian

War with any civilian officials?

A By talks do you mean whether I asked him regarding the progress of the German-Soviet War?

AMIHRO

. Q I mean whether or not you had a conference with them in which the progress of the war was discussed.

.

A I did ask, from time to time, regarding the progress of the war, but there was no need to carry on discussions regarding any such matter, and I myself have no recollection of ever having conducted discussions with Ribbentrop on that point -- with persons other than Ribbentrop on that point.

Q As a matter of fact, shortly prior to 17 November 1941, did you not have a conference with Erdsmandorf relating to the war against Russia?

A As I have written in my affidavit, Erdsmandorf was head of the Japanese Section of the Foreign Office -- was head of the Japanese Section, and there is never any occasion on which an ambassador would talk with a section chief.

MR. TAVENNER: General OSHIMA, I will have to ask the Tribunal to direct you to reply to my questions, rather than going off on some explanation which has nothing to do with my question.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The witness will confine his answers to the questions asked.

A I have never asked him anything in regard to that point. It must be a mistake in his memory.

Q I did not ask you if you asked him anything;

I asked you if you had a conference with him in which the progress of the Russian War was discussed or mentioned.

A I may have had informal conversations with him, but I have never officially discussed that matter with him.

O Then, all this time you knew that you had conferred with nlm, but you had not had an official conference?

A I presume that he gathered such information by assembling ---

Correction: I assume that he obtained such information from conversations held at social gatherings.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Well, we are not asking what you presumed about the source of his information. Let us get directly to the point as to what was in your conversation and I will speak more about what you said than about what Erdmansdorff said. I am not talking about the progress of the Russian war.

Do you not recall and is it not a fact that you told Erdmansdorff that you had no information whatever concerning the intention and the deliberations of the Japanese Government, but according to your own personal opinion that, in view of the time of year, Japanese military operations against the Soviet Union could take place only on a limited scale?

A I do not recall.

Or in a conference with Ribbentrop on 23 March 1942 did not Ribbentrop mention to you that an advance of Japanese armies against Vladivostok in the direction of the Baikal Sea area would be advisable if Japan "elt that she was strong enough?

Maybe he did say so but I do not remember. A

Well, did you not fully agree with Ribbentrop's suggestion and state that although you had received no official communique of the Japanese intentions you favored an advance against Vladivostok within East

22

23

24

.

3 4

5

6

9

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25 Siberia within the year as you were of the opinion that a more opportune time would never arrive again?

A I have no recollection of ever having said anything of the sort and, as a matter of fact, I never even had such thoughts.

Q In a conference with Weiszaecker on 21 April 1942 did you not state that, as a matter of course, it seemed to you that Japan should attack the Russians in East Asia?

A I have no recollection of having made such a thing -- of having said such a thing.

Q And in this conference did you not assure Weiszaecker that you were working hard to put an end to the wholly unnatural situation in which Japan was still living in peace and close neighborliness with the Russian enemy so furiously engaged by Germany?

A May I have the date repeated, please?

Q 21 April 1942.

A I never had such a conference. I knew more than anyone else that it was impossible for Japan to fight a war on two fronts.

Q Regardless of what you may have known or may not have known, I am asking you whether or not you said these things?

A I am replying to you that I fid not make

such remarks.

Q Was not the official request for the Japanese entry into the Russian war made on 9 July 1942?

A According to my recollection I feel that the official request to Japan was made in 1943 and, as I have been repeatedly telling you, this is only my own recollection. Previous to that time many of their requests were repeatedly rejected. This date to which you refer of July 9, 1942, I believe that if a request was made at that time it was denied but that request was not official -- September instead of July.

Q Regardless of whether the request was official or unofficial, did you at this conference on 9 July 1942 with Ribbentrop state that you were well pleased with developments in Russia and North Africa and that you yourself were convinced of the imperativeness of a Japanese attack on Russia?

A I have no such recollection.

Q Did you not indicate to Ribbentrop that you were very enthusiastic over the idea and that you would immediately report the request to Tokyo?

A Does not your question really mean this, that I refused the request on the 9th of July?

Q No, I mean just the opposite, that you agreed to submit the request to Tokyo.

3

2

A I see. If on the 9th of July there was a request from the German side I must have faithfully transmitted it to the Japanese Government.

5

9 And did you also indicate that you were enthusiastic over the idea of Japanese participation in the Russo-German War?

7

A I do not think I conveyed anything except

9

the expressions of diplomatic courtesy.

O Do you mean to tell this Tribunal that

A No, that is not so. The duty of an

government wants to say to another; and what I said

was that even though I knew in my own heart that it

fronts, it was my duty to convey any German request

in this regard to the Japanese and thus at least to

preserve the formal diplomatic procedure.

was impossible for Japan to carry on a war on two

ambassador is to faithfully convey whatever one

11

your approval of the entry of Japan into the Russo-German War was nothing more than a diplomatic gesture

13 14

of courtesy?

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Q I don't intent to criticise you for conveying the request. I am asking you if you didn't advise Ribbentrop that you were enthusiastic over the

```
· ospect of Japan's entering into the Russo-German
     War?
         A No, I did not.
3
4
5
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Q Well, on 30 July, 1942, did you convey to Ribbentrop the Japanese reply to the official request for participation in the Russo-Japanese War? And if you did, what was the reply?

A I am not sure at all as to the dates, but if, on the 9th of July, Germany actually did make a request, naturally at some date later to that date the Japanese Government would have sent a refusal.

Q You conveyed this refusal to Ribbentrop, did you not?

A I think I must have. My memory is not at all certain on this point, but I think I must have taken it myself.

Q What was the ground of refusal?

A I think I must have refused, saying that that was impossible. I could see no other reason.

I conveyed the refusal, saying that such a request was impossible.

Q Well, now, at the time you conveyed this reply to Ribbentrop, did you not advise Ribbentrop that you had cabled Tokyo details of your last talk with him and had also added your own point of view, namely that an early intervention against Russia and intensive action to paralyze English shipping in the Indian Ocean was proper?

A It is not in my recollection.

2

1

.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

2

22

23

24

2.5

Q Did you not also on this occasion state to Ribbentrop that you had personally shared Germany's understanding that today a uniquely favorable opportunity presented itself to Japan to deal a blow to the Russians and moreover that the Japanese Army had always advocated the opinion that such action against Russia was necessary?

A I have no recollection of ever having said any such thing.

Q Didn't you also tell Ribbentrop that undoubtedly there were various opinions in Japan on this matter and that you did not consider the answer that had been given to be final?

A I don't remember ever having made such a statement.

Q Did you not also state that you had proposed again and again to utilize the opportune moment and this would be borne in mind in Japan?

A I didn't.

Q Did you not also state that in spite of the large operations in the south you favored conducting a thrust against Russia, too?

A I don't remember ever having said much a thing.

25

Did you not close your remarks at this con-Q 2 ference with the assurance that in your opinion the 3 advance to the north was Japan's latela. question 4 which you had always reiterated to your government? A I have no recollection of ever having made such an assurance. At a conference with Ribbentrop on 6 march, 1943 did you not advise him that although you did not know the intentions of the military leaders in your 10 Fatherland, nevertheless, you knew that for a 11 long time Japan had the intention of turning against Russia? 13 A Did you say to turn against Russia? 14 Q To turn against Russia, meaning to fight 15 Russia. 16 A I have no recollection of having made such 17 a remark. Q At a conference between you and Ribbentrop 19 at Fusel on 18 April, 1943, did you not state that 20 you knew the Japanese Embassy at Sofia had reported to 21 Tokyo remers about a separate peace between Germany 22 23 and Russia in consequence of which you had arranged 24 for all such telegrams from Scfia to be given to you

and that you had taken measures against its repetition?

A I have no such recollection.

Q Did you receive, in September, 1944, an instruction from your government suggesting conclusion of a separate peace between Germany and Russia?

A I did.

Q In your conversation with Ribbentrop regarding this matter, did you not state that Japan would fight on Germany's side until the final victory?

A I don't recall having made such a statement; but, since Japan was Germany's ally, it was but natural that I should have.

Q General OSHIMA, did you approve of and favor Japanese exploitation of French Indo-China in September, 1941?

A I never heard of that. I received instructions from my home government to the effect that the Japanese Government desired the German Government, through its Ambassador stationed in France, to support the Japanese representations vis-a-vis French Indo-China. But I conveyed these instructions from my home government, but that is as far as I know of the matter.

Q Now, you are very exact in the choice of your language, and you use the word "representations" of the Japanese Government to French Indo-China. But, in this instance, didn't you mean demands on French

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

Indo-China and not representations?

tion.

19

20

22 23

24

25

I am afraid I can't understand your ques-

Vell, I will ask you more in detail. there is a misinterpretation, it will be straightened out in the course of my question. Now, was not the Japanese Government endeavoring at this time to use the German Government to bring pressure on France to accept Japanese demands on French Indo-China?

A I don't believe that Japan had any strong desires in that regard.

Q If MAISUCKA took the position that armed force would be used by the 20th of September unless 14 his demands were accepted, do you mean to say that that was not a determined view?

No such news was conveyed to Germany. I had been in Japan, I might have heard of that, but in Germany I didn't hear about that at all.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until nine-thirty tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, 2 December, 1947, at 0930,)